Appl. No. 10/730,296 Amdt. dated November 21, 2005

Reply to Office action dated September 7, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 7, 2005, claims 11, 13, 16-17, 21, 23, and 26-27 were provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting.

An appropriate terminal disclaimer has been filed to overcome this ground of rejection.

Applicants submit these claims are now in condition for allowance.

The Office Action also rejected claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. The previous amendment to claim 21 made claim 28 an artifact. Therefore, claim 28 has been canceled and claim 29 amended so it properly depends from claim 21. Applicants submit these amendments overcome the section 112 ground of rejection.

As claims 18-20 have been allowed, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Re-examination and allowance of claims 11, 13, 16-17, 21, 23, 26-27, and 29-30 is earnestly solicited.

November 21, 2005

David M. Lockman

Attorney for Applicants

Respectfully Submitted,

Attorney Registration No. 34,214

Maginot, Moore & Beck Bank One Center Tower 111 Monument Circle, Suite 3000 Indianapolis, IN 46204-5115 Telephone: (317) 638-2922